

WHAT ABOUT HER?  
MORTUARY PRACTICE AND GENDER IDENTITIES AT KANESH

A Thesis  
Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of Cornell University  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

by  
Jeanine Malia Hoy  
August 2019

© 2019 Jeanine Malia Hoy

## ABSTRACT

Archaeological studies at the Middle Bronze Age Assyrian trading colony of Kanesh, in the Kayseri Province of modern-day Turkey, have been significantly influenced by historical narratives woven on the basis of the site's rich corpus of 22,500 cuneiform texts. One social group overlooked by such textually-driven scholarship is women, despite their important role as cultural brokers. This thesis seeks to understand social boundaries, specifically gender identities, at Kanesh through the examination of mortuary practices using insights from third wave feminism. The study reexamines burials and their inclusions through an intersectional framework that considers multiple aspects of a person's identity (e.g. gender, age, class, ethnicity). A multidimensional story about Kanesh thus emerges that includes those excluded from the cuneiform texts and existing traditions of archaeological scholarship at the site. The predominant groups identified in burials are females and children; these two categories of people, which have not been discussed in prior studies at Kanesh, are revealed to be a vital part of the community. Moreover, this study observes that there are similarities among the items found in graves, the types of burials, and location of the burials of males, females, and children. Based on these similarities, there seems to be a shared economic status as well as similar material culture across the range of ethnicities represented in the *karum*. As much as the textual evidence drives a narrative focused on Assyrian men, the archaeology of the *karum* reflects a more diverse yet communal identity.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Jeanine Hoy graduated from the University of San Francisco with a bachelor's degree in History, with a focus on European history and the Islamic World. As an undergraduate, she participated in anthropological and archaeological studies in Sitka, Alaska and San Ignacio, Belize. During her time at Cornell University, she took part in archaeological fieldwork in the Maroni valley of Cyprus with Dr. Sturt Manning.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people must be thanked for the completion of this thesis. First of all, I would like to acknowledge my committee members, Lori Khatchadourian and Sturt Manning. I am greatly indebted to them for their patient guidance, continued encouragement, constructive suggestions and careful edits. Thank you for supporting me throughout this process. Secondly, thank you to Dusti Bridges, my confidant and editor. I cannot express enough gratitude for her numerous edits as well as her friendship throughout this process. Her faith in me was invaluable while writing this thesis. I am forever grateful for Kenneth Laws and his endless words of encouragement throughout graduate school and the writing process. Not without his unfailingly support and his constant reassurance could I have produced this thesis. Lastly, my cheering section could not be completed without Margaret and Patrick Hoy. Thank you for your understanding through a process that constantly confused you, for trusting me, and for believing in me when my confidence was shaken. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. All errors are my own.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### PRELIMINARY SECTIONS

Biographical Sketch .....	iv
Acknowledgements .....	v
List Figures .....	vii
List of Tables .....	viii

### CONTENT SECTIONS

Introduction .....	1
Identity and Gender in Archaeology .....	2
Third Wave Feminism and Intersectionality .....	3
Kanesh: An Introduction and Scholarly Overview .....	5
History of Excavations .....	5
Peoples of Kanesh .....	8
Reexamining Gender in Burials at Kanesh .....	10
Analysis: Burials of Kanesh .....	14
Chronology and Stratigraphy .....	15
Sex and Age .....	16
Burial Location and Type .....	17
Grave Inclusions .....	18
Isotope/Osteological reports .....	20
Discussion .....	21
Conclusion .....	26
Appendix .....	29
Bibliography .....	32

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Satellite map of Anatolia marking Kültepe, Kanesh .....	5
Figure 2. Aerial View of Kanesh .....	6
Figure 3. Photogrammetric Map of the Karum .....	15
Figure 4. Stratigraphy of Kanesh .....	16

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Types of Burials .....	17
Table 2. Comparison of Multiple and Single Inhumations .....	18
Table 3. Comparison of Indoor and Outdoor Burials .....	18
Table 4. Comparison of Burials with Grave Goods.....	19



## **Introduction**

Despite concerted attention to gender identities and power relations in many quarters of global archaeology since the 1980s, gender relations at the Bronze Age Anatolian site of Kanesh have gone largely overlooked (*pace* Michel 2013), leaving us with a woefully partial understanding of social life at a site long thought to be critical to reconstructing the history of second millennium BCE in the Near East. The relative invisibility of women in the scholarship on Kanesh has shaped and constrained our understanding of this important trading hub, giving the impression that the female presence was irrelevant to its history. But women very likely played a vital role as social mediators between Anatolian and Assyrian ethnic groups, thus supporting the growth and longevity of Kanesh as a trading center. Moreover, the long-standing preoccupation with ethnic difference between Assyrian traders and indigenous Anatolians has obscured other social boundaries at Kanesh. New excavations and publications of burials at Kanesh, however, provide the opportunity to ask new questions about social difference and, particularly, to explore the life and death of women, as reflected through mortuary practice. Mortuary archaeology can provide information on groups of people that are often excluded from other sources, like texts. Kanesh is an ideal case site for reassessment of gender and identity in archaeology, due to a well-published mortuary record and long history of excavation.

In this thesis, I adopt a third wave feminist approach to examine burials recently uncovered at Kanesh. The framework of third wave feminism emphasizes intersectionality, taking into account all aspects of an individual's identity—gender, race, class, etc.—to understand the social landscape (e.g. Meskell 1999; Ghisleni, Jordan, and Fiocoprile 2016). By surveying the material assemblages in burials with sexed human remains, this study asks to what degree mortuary practice was an arena for expressing and reproducing gender and other

identities. Through the reexaminations of burials, is it possible to understand social boundaries at Kanesh, and particularly gender boundaries? While the biological signifiers of sex do not necessarily define gender, sex can be a useful entry point for a preliminary analysis of gendered social boundaries. Through the critical lens of third wave feminism, a more robust understanding of identity, social boundaries, and lived experiences at Kanesh emerges.

### **Identity and Gender in Archaeology**

Scholars have turned to the archaeological record in order to discern identity among ancient peoples (e.g. Meskell 1999; Gilchrist 1999; Díaz-Andreu García 2005, 2005b; Rowlands 2007; Joyce 2007; Geller 2009; Bolger 2003; Bolger 2010). The study of identity in the past has proven exceptionally productive in ‘peopling’ research that had too often been concerned with broad social processes and individual artifacts, and fundamental to the exploration of social theory-based approaches in archaeology (Robin 2001:20; Insoll 2007:1). Numerous archaeologists have sought to disrupt traditional archaeological narratives by highlighting the experiences of peoples who have been rendered archaeologically invisible (e.g. Conkey and Spector 1984; Baxter 2008). While some scholars remain apprehensive about our ability to understand how ancient people negotiated their identities in relation to those around them (or engage in any empathetic considerations), such apprehension does not automatically preclude the study of identities or negate the value of such an effort (Insoll 2007:1). Archaeology provides a constructive method for examining identities in the past, as the material world permeates every aspect of daily life and can shape and reflect identities and experiences.

Gender archaeology offers a suite of theories and methods for examining the invisible and marginalized people of the past as well as a reflexive lens through which to study the discipline of archaeology itself. Archaeologies of gender derive from feminist critiques of

androcentrism in academic writing and control (Conkey and Spector 1984:3). These critiques highlight the parallels between the neglect of women in the past and the exclusion of women in leadership roles in modern archaeology (Johnson 2010:128-129; Nelson 2004:25). One of the first and most influential works in this area of research remains “Archaeology and the Study of Gender” by Conkey and Spencer (1984). Conkey and Spector (1984:6) argue that the disinterest in studying women in the archaeological record speaks to a larger issue in the archaeological discipline. It was not a lack of information that caused the neglect of gender identities, but rather the androcentrism of archaeology. Feminist theories continue to challenge patriarchal biases, assumptions, and dichotomies that have penetrated every aspect of Western culture (Spencer-Wood 2011:6).

### **Third Wave Feminism and Intersectionality**

In the 1990s, archaeologists studying gender pursued a third wave feminist agenda, which emphasized an intersectional conception of identity consisting of more aspects than simply gender (i.e. race and class) (Michaela di Leonardo 1991; Margaret Conkey and Joan Gero 1997; Lynn Meskell 1999; Roberta Gilchrist 2009). This built upon what is characterized as the first and second waves of feminism, which sought to simply ‘insert’ women into history and then identify women’s spaces and activities (e.g. Nicholson 1997; Meskell 1999; Spencer-Wood 2007; Rubin 1975). Third wave feminism sought to break the boundaries of conventional, dichotomous identity categories by emphasizing the particularities inherent in all of the various social and cultural aspects that inform one’s identity (Meskell 1999: 61). Rather than labelling a person solely on the basis of her/his gender, relying on rigid Western notions of sex and gender identity, third wave scholars stressed the need to expand our perspective to incorporate all aspects of a person’s identity in particular social and cultural settings, such as age, status, class,

ethnicity, and race (Ghisleni et al 2016:771). This “intersectional” approach, strives to be inclusive and diverse in the examination people and their identities (Ghisleni et al 2016:771; Nash 2008:2). Meskell (2007:29) asserts: “Gender identity should be seen as a complex assortment of networks of signifying practice, varying for individuals over time, as it intersects with other networks of signifying practices located in such concepts as class and race.” Rather than solely looking for women or trying to rewrite a gynocentric history, Meskell strives to understand people not only based on gender or sex but also age, ethnicity, and economic status. By blurring the categories of identity formation, a multidimensional analysis emerges that demonstrates the complexity of the human experience.

Several decades after its development, intersectionality continues to be reinterpreted and transformed (Nash 2016). Although many have critiqued the lack of a clear methodology (Nash 2008:4), this flexibility allowed intersectionality to endure. The shifts in uses speak to the analytic’s ability to adapt to a multitude of disciplines over the past three decades. Although the original theories of intersectionality (Crenshaw 1989) were not tailored for archaeological interpretations due to the lack of active living agents (Fahlander 2012), its application to archaeology is useful for studying the past. Intersectionality pushes archaeology to re-conceptualize identity in the ancient world. Studying communities and their cumulative identity allows for complex analysis and detailed picture of their lived experiences. The adoption of a third wave feminist approach offers a greater understanding of the dynamics that shaped those communities. Only by seeing the interred persons in burials as multi-layered individuals with varying social positions can valuable, multidimensional insights about who lived at Kanesh emerge.

## Kanesh: An Introduction and Scholarly Overview

### History of Excavations



Figure 1: Satellite map of Anatolia marking Kültepe, Kanesh (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:20)

The site of Kanesh (ancient endonym), also referred to as Kültepe (modern exonym), is located in the Kayseri Province of modern-day Turkey. Positioned in the center of the Anatolian peninsula at the foot of the highest mountain in the Central Anatolian plateau, Erciyes Dağı (Larsen 2015:17), the location has attracted numerous settlements. Proximity to an abundance of natural resources such as copper, tin, and silver has often provided the impetus for settlement in the region and supported interregional trade routes (Seeher 2011). During the Middle Bronze Age (spanning approximately 2000-1600 BCE), the Old Assyrian trading network connected Assur, Mesopotamia, and Anatolia, creating one of the first cross-regional exchange economics (Larsen 2015). During this time, the city of Kanesh was divided into two areas: the *tepe* and *karum*. *Tepe* refers to the mound within the city, one of the largest mounds in the Near East, while *karum* refers to the lower area surrounding it. The *tepe* was where the ruling elite,

administrative, and religious institutions resided. Surrounding the mound were the site's residential neighborhood and marketplace.



*Figure 2: Aerial View of Kanesh (Larsen 2015:26).  
On the left is the tepe; the upper right area is the karum.*

The primary objective of the early excavations at Kanesh was to recover cuneiform tablets, which remain the dominant source for interpreting daily life in the city. Kanesh was first excavated by Ernest Chantre in 1893 and again in 1906 by Hugo Winckler. Both excavators were primarily interested in the recovery of cuneiform tablets, however both proved unsuccessful. Following Chantre and Winckler's failed expeditions, Czechoslovakian linguist and Assyriologist Bedřich Hrozný began excavations in 1925. Unlike those before him, Hrozný was successful in discovering tablets in the residential area of Kanesh, the *karum*, east of the *tepe* (Larsen 2015:22). Hrozný and his team unearthed over a thousand tablets, bringing Kanesh to the attention of Near Eastern historians and archaeologists. The tablets, written by Assyrians, were found in private houses of the *karum* and focus on business contacts and transactions, familial

finances, loan contracts and personal accounts. Driving the accounts of daily life in the trade center, these tablets have long provided the basis for the assumptions of power structures and social interactions, thus shaping research goals that would pervade the archaeology conducted.

Excavations at the site continued in 1948, under the direction of Tahsin Özgüç and the Turkish Historical Society (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:59). Özgüç was especially driven by ideals of Turkish nationalism and the prospect of unearthing spectacular finds. His research objectives included finding the roots of the Hittite culture in Anatolia as well as discovering more cuneiform tablets. After Özgüç's passing in 2005, Fikri Kulakoğlu assumed the directorship of the site (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:90). Kulakoğlu issued a call for international collaboration as well as a new emphasis on scientific excavation methods (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:91). The reinvigoration of research at the site in areas of archaeological sciences and international collaboration has created a renewed interest in Kanesh within Near Eastern studies.

While scholars have reviewed the chronology of occupation (Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen 2012), economic resources (Lehner 2014; Dercksen 2017), and ethnic interactions at Kanesh (Michel 2014; Larsen and Lassen 2014), the virtually exclusive interpretive authority of the cuneiform tablets has never been questioned. In addition to driving the objectives of the excavators, scholarship on Kanesh continues to resort to the texts alone to reconstruct social relationships and power structures within the *karum* (Larsen 2015, Michel 2014, Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen 2012, Atici 2014a). These efforts, while informative, remain centered on the cuneiform tablets and the sector of the population that controlled them, thus providing little information on other residents of the settlement.

### Peoples of Kanesh

Much attention in the study of social boundaries at Kanesh has focused on the ethnic composition of the city, driven by the information provided by the cuneiform tablets. Ethnic difference and interaction can be challenging to analyze, and researchers often fall into the trap of categorizing people based on parameters that may have served the governing elite more than they reflect lived experiences (Bahrani 2006:48). In order to accurately study social categories of ethnicity, they need to be understood in their own historical contexts (Bahrani 2006:49). Simply relying on ‘data’ collected from textual sources (often the products of the governing elite) is problematic and any additional sources, like archaeology, are important to avoid anachronistic, modern bias. Most scholarship on Kanesh has only considered the interaction between the textually visible Assyrians and the materially visible Anatolians (see Atici 2014b, Michel 2008, Michel 2014, and Larsen 2014), despite the fact that the Assyrian archives document a variety of ethnic groups, such as Hattians, Hurrians, and Luwians, living together in the lower section of the city (Michel 2008, Michel 2014:72). While the demographic profile of Kanesh is difficult to extrapolate due to high mobility at the site, Hertel (2014:43) has concluded that around 3,000-3,500 persons lived in the 9-hectare *karum*.

The focus on the relationship between Assyrian merchants and Anatolian inhabitants, specifically male Anatolians, was due to their involvement in trade. Michel’s (2014) focus on ethnicity considers the relationship between those involved in trade, ignoring other groups who played a variety of roles in the daily life of the city. Mogens Trolle Larsen (Larsen 2014, Larsen and Lassen 2015), similarly preoccupied with ethnic difference and interaction at Kanesh, used Assyrian archives to focus on the Assyrian presence at the site and Kanesh’s relationship with Assur, but his interpretations overlook material culture other than the cuneiform tablets. Atici



(2014a, 2014b), in contrast, included archaeofaunal assemblages in his examination to elucidate ‘silenced’ connections between the Assyrians, Anatolians and the settlement’s various ethnicities, but his conclusions relied on assumptions of ethnic spaces derived from archival materials. Most relevant to the present study is G. Bike Yazicioğlu Santamaria’s (2015) dissertation. Yazicioğlu Santamaria (2015, 2017) performed strontium isotope analysis on twenty-eight teeth from twenty-four individuals (samples collected from six males, ten females, and eight juveniles) belonging to burials excavated in 2006-2008 to explore the ethnic heterogeneity of Kanesh. Her aim was to explore whether a correlation exists between locals and non-locals in the burial areas. This study attempted to move beyond the authority of the Assyrian archives, but the focus remained on ethnic identity and interaction. While scholars have begun to expand their research scope to include other ethnic groups, as attested in the Kanesh archives, the main focus remains centered on Assyrian merchants and their interactions, particularly with other men. The limited scope of the research at Kanesh and the emphasis on the Assyrian presence established by the tablets has led to a certain tunnel-vision among many Kanesh scholars. The emphasis on ethnic difference has gained significantly more consideration than gender difference, thus creating a highly partial understanding of social boundaries within the settlement.

When women have been acknowledged at Kanesh, they are only recognized in their role as wife, and typically only as wives of Assyrian men. Michel (2015; 2014) has highlighted the lives of Assyrian women, focusing on letters exchanged between an Assyrian family in Kanesh and relatives in Assur. Elsewhere, Michel (2010) focuses solely on the Assyrian wife whose husband trades in Kanesh. Michel only acknowledges and discusses Anatolian women when they marry an Assyrian male. Gil Stein (2012) speaks broadly of women in relation to the

Mesopotamian-Anatolian colonial interaction and gendered activities. He claims intercultural marriages were essential alliances created in order to gain access to economic resources and power in trade (Stein 2012:51-52). While he does recognize Anatolian women, Stein speaks vaguely about rigidly conceived gendered divisions of labor and never specifically mentions Kanesh.

This is the extent to which identity and social boundaries have been studied at Kanesh. Although the importance of gender-focused archaeology is well established in global archaeology, its impacts have not reached Kanesh. Apart from the usual identification of sex in burials, there has been little notice of female presence and the role of women in the life of the settlement. The following examination seeks to recognize women in the archaeological record and elucidate various vectors of social difference, contributing to an intersectional understanding of identity at Kanesh.

### **Reexamining Gender in Burials at Kanesh**

Mortuary archaeology has provided a fruitful avenue through which to study social boundaries in the past. Studying burial practices can provide information on groups of people that are often excluded from other sources, such as texts. Women and men are particularly visible in the mortuary record. Osteological analysis, while contingent on the state of preservation, is the ideal method for accurately identifying the sex of human remains. Objects found in the grave can also lend an idea as to the sex of the buried individual, although this method often entails projecting modern assumptions about gender roles onto the past. Moreover, burials are the result of actions taken by living survivors that are consistent with their relationships with the dead person; therefore, the arrangement and choice of burial items may more closely reflect the identities and interests of the survivors rather than the individual in the

grave (Joyce 2009:75). While potentially reductive to assume that sex was always the most important part of people's identities (Joyce 2009:49), this should not deter us from inquiring how sex influenced social boundaries or question the significance of such an investigation.

As a response to the formative work of Judith Butler (1993; 1990), archaeologists have focused on the regulatory modes through which gender was produced and reproduced in earlier communities (Perry and Joyce 2001:65), and the relationship between gender and performance. The archaeological study of regulatory modes, which Perry and Joyce (2001) describe as repeated performative actions, can inform how social relations and gender identities were enacted in the ancient world (Perry and Joyce 2001:74). Gender performance, as a repetitive activity, is strongly material and, therefore, archaeologically visible (Perry and Joyce 2001:67). By observing performative actions in material culture, archaeologists can understand to what extent social mechanisms are reproduced. Bourdieu (1977) explores in depth how the *habitus*, everyday practice, informs various social boundaries. The constitution and maintenance of social differences within a community are a product of individual agency and performance. Daily practice and social boundaries constitute a dialectical process, in which daily actions both shape and are constrained by social boundaries. By combining Butler's model of gender performance and Bourdieu's outline of practice theory, we can understand gender as a daily performative act of negotiating and understanding one's position in the social structure. Through a sense of "being" and "performance," the details of everyday life provide the experience of gender difference (Gilchrist 1999:82), and therefore, social difference. The communication between humans and their material culture plays a role in the formation and continuation of social boundaries.

In what follows, I study gender performance through burials, where specific mortuary performances were enacted numerous times (throughout the levels of occupations) to produce a repetitive gendered practice. I submit that burials are an ideal domain through which to observe social differences. The study of mortuary practices is an effective means to examine performances of identity because burial rituals were carried out by community members. The materials found in burials do not solely reflect the deceased individual; they reflect relationships among the living, societal norms, and the enactment of different identities among the different genders, ages, and statuses at Kanesh. Employing an intersectional framework, I examine burial methods to illustrate how a performative relationship connected to gender identity can be observed.

When formal excavations at Kanesh began in 1948, a large number of skeletons were discovered. Muzaffer Şenyürek published osteological reports in 1952, but for reasons unknown, he never published results from years 1949 or 1950 (Üstündağ 2014:157). Remains found in 1954 were also given to Şenyürek but information on the location of those remains was lost by his untimely death (Üstündağ 2014:158). Machteld Mellink summarized the archaeology of Kanesh, including burials from the 1950s to the 1980s, in short and sporadic annual reports (see Mellink 1955, 1956). Özgüç (1950, 1959, 1986) published multiple excavation monographs but these did not include osteological analyses or a concrete number of burials found. The excavation reports from 1948 and 1949 recorded the burials, but reports from 1950-1958 either give little detail or no mention of any mortuary remains (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:238-239). In addition, the 1949 report of stratigraphic levels was drastically different from the initial 1948 reports (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:65). This lack of details creates an uneven representation of burials uncovered in the 1940s and 1950s. Metin Akyurt created the most extensive catalogue of

all published Kanesh burials from 1957-1991 on a total of 78 graves (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:238, 243). Özgüç (1986) also wrote on the state of the burials, describing the grave goods, burial types, and body positions. While reports on these early graves have been published, little can be said about them for the purposes of this analysis due to inconsistencies in the records and the lack of osteological analysis. Because the graves were studied purely based on their inclusions and did not include osteological analysis I will mostly exclude them from my dataset; however, Özgüç and Yazicioğlu Santamaria's conclusions on grave location and wealth will be considered.

I instead focus on the burials excavated during the 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008 seasons, referring to the earlier datasets only as pertinent to my analysis. While excavations did continue in 2009 and 2012, no mortuary remains were encountered in the lower town. Only one male burial was discovered on the *tepe*, containing rich grave goods dating to the turn of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC. Analysis on the *karum* burials has been minimal apart from the work of Handan Üstündağ and Yazicioğlu Santamaria. Üstündağ (2014) has studied the skeletal remains, analyzing various health indicators, including the physiology stress levels and joint diseases. Yazicioğlu Santamaria has studied the mortuary contexts of the graves and questioned whether Kanesh can be called an “Assyrian” trade center. The Yazicioğlu Santamaria and Üstündağ publications mention the presence of females in the burials, but they do not offer further analysis.

It should be said that variability in quality of publication and depth analysis notwithstanding, the total assemblage of burials at Kanesh is conspicuously low. Although the full size of the city and population are still unknown, a major trading center of Kanesh's size should be unearthing a larger number of burials. Thomas Klitgaard Hertel (2014) estimates the population of Kanesh's *karum* to have been around 3,000-3,500, determined from 9 hectares of

excavated houses and archival information. Gojko Barjamovic (2014), who examined the size of Kanesh in the Early Middle Bronze Age and considered the larger area surrounding the *tepe*, estimates the population to be closer to 25,000 based on 170 hectares. Regardless of either estimation, the number of burials excavated at Kanesh should be much higher—well into the hundreds, at the very least. Akyurt’s extensive catalogue, which includes published burials from 1957-1991, only totals to 78 graves. Including the number of burials from 2005-2008 seasons, there have only been 122 skeletons unearthed at Kanesh. Moreover, during preliminary archaeobotanical investigations, Andrew Fairburn (2014:180-181) notes the landscape surrounding Kanesh was an attractive environment for habitation due to its reliable water supply, abundant resources, and varying ecosystems. This suggests that the population of Kanesh could have easily increased over the life of the settlement, and yet the number of burials uncovered have been modest. Perhaps this is due to the partial area of the site that has been excavated and limited geospatial analysis conducted.

### **Analysis: Burials at Kanesh**

In the 2005-2008 seasons, excavators unearthed 26 interments on opposite sides of the *karum*, Area 1 and Area 2, containing a total of 43 individuals. The single burial found on the *tepe*, Person 44, with rich grave goods, will be excluded because it is located beyond the *karum*, the focus of the present study. While the published materials report on 26 interments, only 24 of them contained skeletal remains. These 24 interments form the dataset for Yazicioğlu Santamaria’s dissertation. As I am using Yazicioğlu Santamaria’s maps and Appendix 2 (2015:509-515), the following makes use of her dataset and labels, however the analysis is my own.



Figure 3: Photogrammetric plan of the karum at Kanesh (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:273). Area 1 and Area 2 where 2006-2008 burials were found.

### Chronology and Stratigraphy

Kanesh's *karum*, the lower town, was occupied during the Middle Bronze Age. Based on the extensive research and dendrochronological sequences in concurrence with radiocarbon ( $^{14}\text{C}$ ) measurements (Manning, Griggs, and Lorentzen et al. 2016:20-21) as well as the Revised Eponym List (Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen 2012:30-31), the Middle Bronze Age occupation dates to 1980-1700 B.C.E. All the burials analyzed here are from this period. The stratigraphy shows Level II is the oldest and is followed by a destruction or abandonment layer. Level Ib

follows with another destruction or abandonment layer. Finally, Level Ia is the youngest from the Middle Bronze Age and the site is abandoned for years after this layer. The burials were found within Level Ia/Ib *in situ* with architectural remains.

Tepe structures			Periods	lower town structures	
citadel	terrace	levels		levels	Karum area
	simple houses	1	Roman Period		cemetery
		2			
	abandonment		Hellenistic Period		abandonment
	no architecture	3			cemetery & winery
	abandonment		Iron Age		
	destruction by Neo-Assyrians				
	Neo-Hittite orthostats	4			no settlement
	no settlement				
	tumulus on western terrace	5	(Old Hittite)		
	abandonment				abandonment
Warsama palace renovations	Anitta's storage building	6		Ia	domestic structures and intramural graves
	destruction & brief abandonment (?)				destruction & abandonment (?)
Warsama palace	Temples 1 and 2	7	MBA	Ib	domestic structures, archives, workshops and intramural graves
	destruction & abandonment				destruction & abandonment
old palace	southern palace	8		II	domestic structures, archives, workshops and intramural graves
	stratigraphic trench				brief abandonment (?)
	small houses	9	Transitional Period	III	domestic structures and intramural graves
	grain silo later used as trash pit	10		IV	domestic structures and intramural graves
	"pilaster building"	11a	EBA 3		virgin soil
	"megaron building", round graves	11b			
	multi-room monumental building	12	EBA 2		
		13			
		14			
	simple houses and cist & pithos graves	15			
		16	EBA 1		
		17		*	indicates abandonment
	simple houses & simple graves	18		*	indicates destruction by fire
	virgin soil				

Figure 4: Stratigraphy of Kanesh. The burials were found in the lower town structure (karum) and concentrated in the Middle Bronze Area (MBA). (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:108)

### Sex and Age

Measurement of the os coxae and cranial morphology determined the sex of the 43 individuals in these graves. There are more adult female burials (19) than adult male burials (9). The remaining 16 skeletons are non-adults ranging from infants (1-2 years) to adolescents (15-19 years). Every age group is represented among the 43 individuals. Excluding the adults, children



with ages ranging from 3-9 years are the largest youth group represented in nine burials. The number of infant graves, four, were the next highest. In addition, six burials containing the remains of female (4) and male (2) adults 50+ and 60+ years old indicated a limited number of the population reached older ages.

### *Burial Location and Type*

Burials found in Area 1 span over a longer period of time, including Level Ib and Ia, whilst Area 2 grave distribution occurs only in Level Ib. There are six different types of interment practices represented in Area 1 and 2: simple inhumation (eight graves), stone cist graves (six graves), burial in bathtub (five graves), burial in large storage jar (four graves), inhumation covered with ceramic sherds (two graves), and inhumation circled by stones (one grave). In Area 1, there is a significant number of simple inhumation graves in comparison to

Type of Grave	Total Graves	Female	Male	Undetermined (N/A)
Stone Cist Burial	6	7	2	5
Simple Inhumation	8	6	4	2
Jar/ Storage Jar Burials	4	1	2	3
Burial in Bathtub	5	3		4
Inhumation Circled by Stones	1		1	
Inhumation Covered with Sherds	2	1		2
Total	26	18	9	16

*Table 1: Types of Burials  
Displaying types of graves and their breakdown concerning sex.*

Area 2. Stone cist graves are largely found in Area 2. The different tomb types appear not to reveal patterning with respect to sex of the interred. There are seven female stone cist burials and six female simple inhumations while the remaining six females were buried in a large jar (two), bath tub (three), or an inhumation covered with sherds (one). Males are found buried mainly in simple inhumations (four) followed by stone cist graves (two), storage jars (two), and

an inhumation circled by stones (one). There were twelve single burials and thirty-one individuals found in multiple burials. Six graves had two individuals, five graves had three individuals, and one grave had four individuals. Burials containing females usually had more than one skeleton (30%) compared to males buried interred with other (9%). Males, while not the largest number of single inhumations, were more commonly found alone.

Multiple Inhumation			Single Inhumation		
Female	Male	N/A	Female	Male	N/A
13 (30%)	4 (9%)	13 (30%)	5 (12%)	5 (12%)	3 (7%)

*Table 2: Comparison of Multiple and Single Inhumations  
Displaying numbers of inhumations and their breakdown in regards to sex.*

While there appears to be no standardization with respect to sex between the body position or orientation, the location of females can offer some insight. Adults, adolescents, and children are found buried within and outside of houses, but infants are never found outside of a domestic context. Twelve of the 43 individuals were excavated outside of homes. Out of the 43 skeletons excavated, 13 (30%) females were found in house burials while only 5 (12%) of male burials were indoors. This pattern indicates that it was more important for females to be buried inside rather than males. Another observation of note is that the 13 (30%) skeletons in which sex was undeterminable were found inside houses, with 11 classified as being infant or children while the remaining two were identified as adolescents under the age of 20.

Inside Houses			Outdoor Graves		
Female	Male	N/A	Female	Male	N/A
12 (28%)	5 (12%)	14 (32%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)

*Table 3: Indoor vs Outdoor Burials  
Displaying the location of graves and their relationship to sex.*

### Grave Inclusions

Similar material culture is found throughout the house graves, a pattern that calls into question materially constituted ethnic differences between native and immigrant groups (Özgüç

2003; Michel 2014:73; Atici 2014:198; Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:440). While the material culture found in the burials do not suggest varying economic groups, Üstündağ's osteological reports indicate the burials from Area 1 and 2 represent a group of lower economic status. The types of goods found in the graves include numerous ceramics, such as pitchers and jugs, bronze pins and rings, silver fragments, and copper bracelets. Graves unattached to houses contain either no grave goods (as seen in A1/G1, A1/G2, A1/G3) or very rich fragments of precious metals such as bronze, silver, and gold (as seen in A1/G4 containing Persons 18, 19, 20 and A2/G1 containing Persons 40, 41, 42). Burials in houses tend to contain ceramic housewares (jugs in A2/H1/G2) and precious metal adornments (bronze pin in A1/H3/G1).

	With Grave Goods			Without Grave Goods		
	Female	Male	N/A	Female	Male	N/A
Area 1	7	3	4	4	3	2
Area 2	7	1	10	0	2	0
Total	14 (32%)	4 (9%)	14 (32%)	4 (9%)	5 (12%)	2 (5%)

*Table 4: Comparison of Burials with Grave Goods  
Displaying burials with and without grave goods with respect to sex.*

The graves found with the most inclusions were burials containing female remains. 32 percent of female burials contain grave goods, compared with only 9 percent of male burials with grave goods. Most grave materials were found in female burials, with great similarity across what we would assume may be class, based on similar material culture, burial type, and osteological reports, as well as across ethnic lines, insofar as isotopic results suggest the inhabitants of Area 1 and Area 2 were diverse. The common objects found throughout the burials with women were trefoil-mouth jugs and pitchers (A1/G4, A2/H1/G1 and G2, and A2/H3/G1) and bronze adornment items such as pins and rings (A1/H1/G2, A1/G4/ and A2/H1/G3). Unless buried with a female, males were usually found with beak-spouted pitchers (A1/H1/G1) or no offerings (A1/G1, A1/G6, A2/H5/G1). Broadly similar types of ceramics are found in burials

containing males and females as well as young children. Through this analysis we see that there are no immediately visible differences in the material culture, architecture, or mortuary structures between the two areas that would suggest distinction of wealth, occupation, or native/non-native households.

The 78 graves published by Akyurt (1998) reported on large amounts of grave goods such as clothing pins, jewelry, as well as axes and daggers. While it is tempting to assume sex based on grave inclusions, the lack of an osteological report means sexing of the skeletons was based on grave inclusions (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:255), which is why I found it necessary to exclude these from my dataset in the discussion to follow. Özgüç (1986:24) also stated that when graves were opened up for the burial of another individual, objects could have been removed, presenting complications of attributing sex as well as economic statuses to any of the individuals. Lastly, Yazicioğlu Santamaria (2015:267) acknowledges that a significant number of graves were robbed and disturbed, yielding unreliable analysis.

#### Isotope/Osteological reports

The small number of burials recovered does not provide enough of a population with which to accurately recreate a demographic profile of Kanesh (Yazicioğlu Santamaria 2015:391, Üstündağ 2014:161). Üstündağ (2014:168) diagnosed both male and female inhabitants with porotic hyperostosis and cribra orbitalia due to an iron deficiency anemia and/or megaloblastic anemia. The causes of these diseases were related to repeated or enduring physical stress on the body (such as long travel), infections, and nutritional deficiencies. The high number of porotic hyperostosis and cribra orbitalia cases at Kanesh indicate poor sanitation, not uncommon for a high traffic economic center. Üstündağ also concluded that there was a high number of instances of osteoarthritis in adults compared with data from other Anatolian cities at this time (2014:169).

Adult males were much more affected by osteoarthritis (71%), however a significant number of adult females (58%) also exhibited the joint disease (Üstündağ 2014:167).

## **Discussion**

Reexamining the burials at Kanesh and focusing on gender boundaries in conjunction with ethnicity, age, and economic status offers a window into the complexity of social life at the settlement. While a full intersectional analysis is beyond the scope of this thesis, I aim to contribute to such a project. This reexamination of Kanesh in particular focuses on the performative material correlates relating to gender, age, and economic status in the burials of the *karum*. Although risky to assume that sex was always a vital part of people's identities (Joyce 2009:49), there are clear distinctions between females and males as well as children in the burials at Kanesh. The regulatory modes through which gender was produced and reproduced can be seen in the care taken with the burials of women and, by extension, children.

The repetitive performance displayed in the burials can be seen primarily in the graves of females. The greatest represented demographic in the burials were young females between the ages of 18 and 30, like due to labor complications during this time period (Chamberlain 2006:48). Given the dominance of adult females over males and children, it can be said that performances of mortuary ritual occurred more frequently for deceased female members of the community than others. It may also be concluded, due to the number of female burials found in houses rather than outside, that the female mortuary rituals were private familial occasions. The lack of visibility of female burials implies that the community performed their grief in private spaces, whereas male deaths, more commonly commemorated outside the house, required a more public display of mourning. As shown in Kanesh texts, males were involved in the trade center and lived very active public lives while females lived private lives. Although a male death may

have been a loss to the community, requiring communal displays of grief, the death of a female, especially of an expectant mother, was a loss to the familial structure and the continuity of the household.

While males found with females contained grave goods, males buried alone rarely did. This performative action indicates a special attention and different mortuary practices required for deceased females at Kanesh, contrary to the ‘background’ status often attributed to them. Objects found with females were tied not only to the ritual itself but also to their identity, indicating aspects of social positions memorialized, and possibly with needs in the afterlife. The relative abundance of goods tied to women’s social lives, including ceramic vessels and jewelry, indicates a greater material investment of the household in extending women’s social lives into the afterlife. The repeated process of placing objects with females indicates the importance of continuing their social identity and representing their ongoing relationships with living people.

The high number of female burials can be attributed to the childbearing age and poor sanitation conditions, a typical factor of demography in pre-modern urban settings. Others have argued that females are more often commemorated if they perish prior to their husbands, which may explain the amount of female burials with grave goods at Kanesh (Chamberlain 2006:48). The high number of infant burials may also be ascribed to the poor hygiene attested to in Üstündağ’s report. Coupling this information with the osteological analysis, a clearer image of Kanesh females and their lived experience in the *karum* appears. High mortality rates afflicted the lives of pregnant females. Although there is no textual evidence to verify the difficulty experienced in childbirth at Kanesh, there are archives from 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE Mesopotamia that provide comparative accounts of the tumultuous nature of labor (Couto-Ferreira 2014:292). Multiple sources offer instructions as well as remedies on how to deal with problems during

pregnancy, to assist the mother in difficult labor, and to handle post-partum conditions (Couto-Ferreira 2014:291). In addition to multiple types of remedies, the texts also include lamentations on the premature death of women in childbirth in heartbreaking language (Couto-Ferreira 2014:292-293). Lastly, it should come as no surprise that a majority of these texts were written by men, highlighting further how the male perspective regarded these scenes. They do not shy away from detailing or downplaying the anguish females experienced in childbirth, thus implying an understanding of the pain and danger involved in labor. These comparative texts provide an image of how tumultuous pregnancy and childbirth was in the ancient world, especially in the ancient Near East.

Moreover, children also represent a vital category in demographic reconstructions (Baxter 2005:101). The second highest demographic represented in the Kanesh burials are infants ranging from ages 1-6, a frequent characteristic of premodern populations (Chamberlain 2006:178). This high number of deaths in early childhood demonstrate how unpredictable life was for children and how diseases plagued their early life, especially in large populated urban settings. Even if infants survived childbirth, mother and father likely watched cautiously hoping their child did not perish in childhood. This is attested in the great care and grave goods given to child burials. A majority of infant burials were in houses and had items such as trefoil-mouthed jugs (A2/H1/G2) and lead or bronze rings (A1/H4/G1 and A2/H4/G2). The sex of the infant burials were unidentifiable (N/A) and cannot contribute to a gendered analysis of their daily life. The similar performativity exhibited in child grave inclusions indicates that deceased children were similarly considered and treated regardless of gender.

The roles of women in death at Kanesh can be seen as an extension of the roles they occupied in life. Through intermarriage, women could become agents of social integration at the

trading center. Women used their social position to consolidate a site experiencing a period of growth, development, and culture contact. Kathleen Deagan (1983, 2001) has written extensively about women as “cultural brokers” who are vital to shaping the course of social integration, especially in colonial settings. Specifically, she highlights the intermarriages between Spanish colonists and Indigenous women and the creation of new social categories (1983, 2001). She emphasizes the agency of women on imperial frontiers and their ability to forge new social connections as a response to their changing world (1983, 2001). Similarly, in Stuart Tyson Smith’s work (2003a, 2003b), the author discusses ceramic traditions and Egyptian imperial interaction on the Nubian frontier. Smith postulates that the mixed material culture along the border of Egypt and Nubia indicates social integration between Egyptian colonists and Nubia women. In Deagan and Smith’s work, we can see women acting as agents of social coalescence in colonial encounters.

Similar processes may have been at work at Kanesh, where, through intermarriage, Anatolian women could have acted as social brokers, mediating relations among Anatolian groups, Assyrian merchants as well as other immigrants. While the texts might indicate separate narratives of Assyrians, Anatolians, and other immigrants, the homogeneity of the material culture portrays the community at Kanesh as one that interacted and intermarried a great deal (Michel 2010). In addition, recent reports have acknowledged women could buy, own, and inherit houses and land at Kanesh (Michel 2016), indicating that women could have authority and wealth, independent of man. This raises the question of how the women of Kanesh used their agency— or were used—for Assyrian colonial efforts. The role of women in relation to colonial endeavors at Kanesh can be envisioned in two ways. One possibility is that adopted an ‘active’ role, responding to the incoming flux of immigrants to the trade center and inserting themselves



into social landscape. The other possibility is that women were ‘passive’ agents of power, exploited purely for their resources and local connections, and utilized for their functional social position in the community. Regardless of the interpretive lens, women at Kanesh clearly shaped Bronze Age Kanesh and entangled their lives with Assyrians and immigrants.

It stands to reason that women were vital to the social landscape of Kanesh, however more research still needs to be done to understand the impact that intermarriage had on social cohesion at Kanesh. Yazicioğlu Santamaria is already laying the groundwork for further investigations into marriage ties between locals and immigrants in relation to her isotope results (2017). Although hesitant to refer to these intermarital relations as “colonial encounters” and yielding to the tyranny of the texts claiming the site as an Assyrian Trade Center, I do acknowledge the value of the colonial framework and its ability to recentralize the female presence and power at Kanesh. By highlighting their authority as landowners and their influence in intermarriages, the role of women at Kanesh is brought to the fore.

Apart from the larger number of females and children burials seen in the 2006-2008 graves, the types of burials, grave inclusions, and locations were similar between the two areas of the *karum*. The range of burial methods seen throughout the *karum* over multiple levels of occupation indicates that one burial practice was not reserved for certain members of any social category, male or female, young or old. The lack of any discernible difference in the 2006-2008 burial materials that might identify wealth differentials leads me to conclude the people of Area 1 and Area 2, though on opposite sides of the *karum*, shared a similar economic status. This conclusion paints a very different picture than the burials referenced by Mellink (1955; 1956). The similarity in materials unearthed across the burials speaks to a social connection that perhaps extended throughout the lower town community. It would appear that, on some level, diverse

members of the *karum* participated in a shared a communal identity that crossed social boundaries.

Throughout this analysis of the Kanesh burials, the presence and importance of females as well as children in understanding daily life has been emphasized. These two groups and their presence has been dismissed from the narrative of the site for too much of its history. We can see through burials how specific performances were enacted numerous times (throughout the levels) to reproduce specific gender differences. While females are occasionally recognized for their role as wives, children are seldom mentioned in texts. This is the first imperative step toward developing a broader picture of Kanesh, incorporating different identities and experiences than that of the Assyrian or Anatolian male. By adopting an intersectional third wave feminist approach, emphasizing more than just one aspect of one's identity, and actively pursuing research that incorporates multiple narratives, multiple identities within Kanesh can emerge.

## **Conclusion**

This examination is meant as a starting point for others to expand upon in the future. While the sample set is curiously small and primarily determined by what was available for analysis, the purpose of this preliminary evaluation is to draw scholarly attention to the role of women, as well as children, at Kanesh and in the Bronze Age Anatolian city through the application of a third wave feminist framework. By highlighting the presence of female burials in relation to their age and economic status as well as their marital status, we can begin to understand a complex social identity previously unacknowledged at Kanesh. The women of Kanesh were uniquely positioned to act as cultural brokers, enabling the growing trade center to flourish. While this thesis has laid the groundwork for a fuller understanding of social life at Kanesh, questions still remain that should be the focus of future objectives. The next steps of

future mortuary investigations need to be expanding the dataset through additional burial excavations. As Barjamovic did, researchers need to expand their vision of how large the trade center could have been. More surveying of the immediate and surrounding area needs to be conducted. The formation of the Archaeological Survey Project in Kayseri Province, KAYAP (Kayseri Arkeolojik Yüzey Araştırmaları Projesi) is already working to enrich our understanding of the Kayseri region and shed light on the formation of Kanesh during the Bronze Age (Kontani, Sudo, Yamaguchi, Hayakawa, Odaka 2014:95-97). Using a broad range of methodologies, the researchers have surveyed 106 archaeological sites and have confirmed based on preliminary analysis that Kanesh was surrounded by a number of small settlements (Kontani et al, 2014:104). These results can potentially form the basis for future mortuary archaeology in these surrounding settlements. Apart from additional data, also required is a shift in research focus. In order to develop a more robust picture of the role of intermarriage on social cohesion and the prosperity of the trading center, the women of Kanesh need to become a research focus.

Kanesh burials offer the opportunity to examine the interactive relationships involving a large group over some 200 years, shedding light on social boundaries and gender dynamics. I have asserted that intersectionality provides a useful approach through which to understand the various aspects of identity, especially in populations that may be overlooked in the archaeological record. Examining aspects of identity typically overlooked, as I have done here with gender at Kanesh, can contribute to the overarching goals of an intersectional analysis. The more we understand various vectors of difference in the study of identities and their complexities, the more we are able to develop an image of daily life in Middle Bronze Age Anatolian cities. Recognizing women as a vital social category to the social landscape of the settlement highlights the reflexivity of their identity acquired as they navigated through their

lives. This also relates to the treatment of children in the archaeological record-- due to their age and lack of social standing, they are often forgotten or unmentioned in history. Yet, the performances displayed, the location, and materials exhibited in burials indicate their importance to the Kanesh community. This discussion provides the first step to acknowledging the neglected female presence and investigating further the other aspects of their everyday experiences. By reexamining performative material culture associated with the female, we can improve our understanding of identity during the Bronze Age in Anatolia while developing a clearer representation of lived experiences across the settlement.

## Appendix 1

Master Burial List Lower Town Area 1						
Level	Area/House	Grave Numbers	Type of Grave	Grave Preservation	Body Orientation	Grave Goods
Ib	Area 1/ House 1	A1/H1/G1	inhumation circled by stones	very poor	E-W	beak-spouted pitcher, jar (inside)
		A1/H1/G2	simple inhumation	very poor	E-W	bronze ring, bowl (outside)
		A1/H1/G3	simple inhumation	very poor	unidentified	none
	Area 1/ House 2	A1/H2/G1	burial in large storage jar	well-preserved	NW-SE	bowl (outside)
	Area 1/ House 3	A1/H3/G1				
			burial in bathtub	looted	N-S	bronze pin (inside)
	Area 1/ House 4	A1/H4/G1	jar burial	very poor	NW-SE	3 lead rings (inside)
		A1/H4/G2	burial in bathtub	well-preserved	NE-SW	bone pin, bronze pin, bronze object (inside), bowl, beak-spouted pitcher (outside)
A1/H4/G3		burial in large storage jar	well-preserved	NW-SE	lead ring, bronze pin (inside)	
Ib/Ia	Area 1/ Grave 1	A1/G1	simple inhumation	very poor	unidentified	none
	Area 1/ Grave 2	A1/G2	simple inhumation	very poor	unidentified	none
	Area 1/ Grave 3	A1/G3	simple inhumation	very poor	unidentified	none
Ia	Area 1/ Grave 4	A1/G4				bone inlay, bronze ring, bronze and gold pins, silver foil, rhython, trefoil-mouth jug (inside); gold foil, bronze pin, rhython, trefoil-mouth jug (outside)
			stone cist grave	disturbed and looted	NE-SW	
I (?)	Area 1/ Grave 5	A1/G5	simple inhumation	very poor	unidentified	none
	Area 1/ Grave 6	A1/G6	simple inhumation	very poor	unidentified	none

Master Burial List Lower Town Area 2						
Level	Area/House	Grave Numbers	Type of Grave	Grave Preservation	Body Orientation	Grave Goods
I/Ib	Area 2/ House 1	A2/H1/G1	stone cist grave	disturbed, possibly robbed	E-W	silver fragments near skull, bronze toggle pin (inside), trefoil-mouth jug, jug (outside)
		A2/H1/G2	stone cist grave	disturbed and looted	E-W	3 trefoil-mouth jugs, unfinished cylinder seal, lead fragments (inside)
		A2/H1/G3	stone cist grave	disturbed and looted	N-S	trefoil-mouth jug, pitcher, bronze pin (inside)
	Area 2/ House 2	A2/H2/G1	inhumation covered with sherds	well-preserved	NE-SW	two-handled bowl (inside)
Ib	Area 2/ House 3	A2/H3/G1	inhumation covered with sherds	disturbed by ground water	W-E	copper bracelet, food offerings (inside), storage jar, trefoil-mouth jug (outside)
		A2/H3/G2	burial in large storage jar	well-preserved	E-W	none
		A2/H3/G3	burial in large storage jar	well-preserved	N-S	none
		A2/H3/G4	stone cist grave	well-preserved	E-W	miniature jar (outside)
	Area 2/ House 4	A2/H4/G1	simple inhumation	disturbed by later architecture	N-S	teapot with strainer, amorphous bronze fragment (inside)
		A2/H4/G2	burial in bathtub	disturbed, possibly looted	E-W	one-handled drinking cup, bronze ring above ribcase (inside)
	Area 2/ Grave 1	A2/G1	stone cist grave	disturbed by rodents and later architecture	NW-SE	copper bracelet, teapot, trefoil-mouth juglet, beak-spouted pitcher (inside), ceramic vessel, 17 astragali (outside)
Ib	Area 2/ House 5	A2/H5/G1	burial in large storage jar	poor condition, looted	NE-SW	none

Breakdown of Sex, Age, Body Position Lower Town Area 1							
Level	Grave Numbers	Type of Grave	Grave Goods	Person No.	Age	Sex	Body Position
Ib	A1/H1/G1	inhumation circled by stones	beak-spouted pitcher, jar (inside)	Person 1	MA 40-50	M	unidentified, head to E
	A1/H1/G2	simple inhumation	bronze ring, bowl (outside)	Person 2	OA 50+	F	extended, dorsal, head to E
	A1/H1/G3	simple inhumation	none	Person 3	YA 20-25	M ?	unidentified
				Person 4	OA 60+	F	unidentified
				Person 5	Child 9	N/A	unidentified
				Person 6	Child 5	N/A	unidentified
	A1/H2/G1	burial in large storage jar	bowl (outside)	Person 7	YA 25-30	F	contracted, on side, head to N
	A1/H3/G1	burial in bathtub	bronze pin (inside)	Person 8	MA 35-40	F	contracted, on side head to N
	A1/H4/G1	jar burial	3 lead rings (inside)	Person 9	YA 30-35	F?	unidentified
	A1/H4/G2	burial in bathtub	bone pin, bronze pin, bronze object (inside), bowl, beak-spouted pitcher (outside)	Person 10	Adolescent	N/A	unidentified
Ib/Ia				Person 11	infant 1-2	N/A	contracted
				Person 12	infant 2-3	N/A	unidentified
	A1/H4/G3	burial in large storage jar	lead ring, bronze pin (inside)	Person 13	OA 60+	F	contracted, on side, head to NE
	A1/G1	simple inhumation	none	Person 14	N/A	N/A	unidentified
	A1/G2	simple inhumation	none	Person 15	YA 20-25	M	unidentified
	A1/G3	simple inhumation	none	Person 16	Adult	F?	unidentified
				Person 17	Adult	F	unidentified
Ia	A1/G4	stone cist grave	bone inlay, bronze ring, bronze and gold pins, silver foil, rhyton, trefoil-mouth jug (inside); gold foil, bronze pin, rhyton, trefoil-mouth jug (outside)	Person 18	OA 60+	M	contracted, on side, head to NE
				Person 19	YA 20-25	F	contracted, on side, head to NE
				Person 20	YA 20-25	F	unidentified
I ?	A1/G5	simple inhumation	none	Person 21	MA 40-45	M	unidentified
	A1/G6	simple inhumation	none	Person 22	YA 20-25	F	unidentified
				Person 23	Adolescent 18-19	M	unidentified

Breakdown of Sex, Age, Body Position Lower Town Area 2							
Level	Grave Numbers	Type of Grave	Grave Goods	Person No.	Age	Sex	Body Position
I/Ib	A2/H1/G1	stone cist grave	silver fragments near skull, bronze toggle pin (inside), trefoil-mouth jug, jug (outside)	Person 24	YA 20-25	F	extended, dorsal, head to W, face to N
				Person 25	Child 8-9	N/A	unidentified
				Person 26	Child 3-4	N/A	unidentified
	A2/H1/G2	stone cist grave	3 trefoil-mouth jugs, unfinished cylinder seal, lead fragments (inside)	Person 27	MA 35-45	M	unidentified
				Person 28	YA 20-25	F	unidentified
				Person 29	YA 18-20	F	unidentified
				Person 30	Infant 1.5-2	N/A	unidentified
	A2/H1/G3	stone cist grave	trefoil-mouth jug, pitcher, bronze pin (inside)	Person 31	OA 50+	F	unidentified
	A2/H2/G1	inhumation covered with sherds	two-handled bowl (inside)	Person 32	Adolescent 15-16	N/A	contracted, on right side, head to SW
				Person 33	Child 9-10	N/A	unidentified
Ib	A2/H3/G1	inhumation covered with sherds, covered with larger vessel	copper bracelet, food offerings (inside), storage jar, trefoil-mouth jug (outside)	Person 34	YA 20-25	F?	contracted, on left side, head to W
				Person 35	Infant 3-4	N/A	unidentified
	A2/H3/G2	burial in large storage jar	no burial offerings	Person 36	OA 60+	M?	contracted, on left side, arms crossed over chest, head to W
	A2/H3/G3	burial in large burial jar	no burial offerings	N/A	N/A	N/A	no skeleton
	A2/H3/G4	stone cist grave	miniature jar (outside)	N/A	N/A	N/A	no skeleton
	A2/H4/G1	simple inhumation	teapot with strainer, amorphous bronze fragment (inside)	Person 37	YA 20-25	F	extended, dorsal, hands joined on belly, head to N, face to E
	A2/H4/G2	burial in bathtub	one-handled drinking cup, bronze ring above ribcase (inside)	Person 38	Child 5-6	N/A	unidentified
				Person 39	Child 4-5	N/A	unidentified
	A2/G1	stone cist grave	copper bracelet, teapot, trefoil-mouth juglet, beak-spouted pitcher (inside), ceramic vessel, 17 astragali (outside)	Person 40	MA 40-50	F	unidentified
				Person 41	Child 8	N/A	unidentified
IB				Person 42	Child 4-5	N/A	unidentified
	A2/H5/G1	burial in large storage jar	no burial offerings	Person 43	YA 25-30	M	face to SE

## Bibliography

Akyurt, I. Metin.

- 1998 *M.Ö. 2. Binde Anadolu'da Ölü Gömme Adetleri. / Bestattungssitten Anatoliens im Zweiten Vorchristlichen Jahrtausend (Zusammenfassung)*. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları Series VI, volume 49. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Atici, Levent.

- 2014a Tracing Inequality from Assur to Kültepe/Kanesh: Merchants, Donkeys, and Clay Tablets. *Animals and Inequality in the Ancient World*. Benjamin S. Arbuckle, and Sue Ann McCarty, eds. Pp. 231- 250. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado.
- 2014b Food and Ethnicity at Kültepe-Kanesh: Preliminary Zooarchaeological. *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity. Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series, 4*. Levent Atici, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, eds. Pp.195-212. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press.

Bahrani, Zainab.

- 2006 Race and Ethnicity in Mesopotamian Antiquity. *World Archaeology* 38(1). JSTOR: 48–59.

Barjamovic, Gojko.

- 2014 The Size of Kanesh and the Demography of Early Middle Bronze Age Anatolia. *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity. Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series, 4*. Levent Atici, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, eds. Pp.55-68. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press.

Barjamovic, Gojko, Thomas Hertel, and Mogens Trolle Larsen.

- 2012 *Ups and Downs at Kanesh: Chronology, History and Society in the Old Assyrian Period. PIHANS, 120*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut Voor Het Nabije Oosten.

Baxter, Jane Eva.

- 2008 The Archaeology of Childhood. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 37(1): 159–175.
- 2005 *The Archaeology of Childhood: Children, Gender, and Material Culture*. Gender and Archaeology Series, v. 10. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Bolger, Diane.

- 2010 The Dynamics of Gender in Early Agricultural Societies of the Near East. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 35(2): 503–531.
- 2003 *Gender in Ancient Cyprus: Narratives of Social Change on a Mediterranean Island*. Gender and Archaeology. Walnut Creek; Lanham: AltaMira Press.



- Bourdieu, Pierre.  
1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Butler, Judith.  
1993 *Bodies that matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge.  
  
1990 *Gender trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Chamberlain, Andrew T.  
2006 *Demography in Archaeology*. Cambridge Manuals in Archaeology. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Conkey, Margaret W., and Joan M. Gero.  
1997 Programme to Practice: Gender and Feminism in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26:411-437
- Conkey Margaret W. and Janet Spector.  
1984 Archaeology and the Study of Gender. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 7:1-38.
- Couto-Ferreira, M. Érica.  
2014 She will give birth easily: therapeutic approaches to childbirth in 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE cuneiform sources. *Dynamis* 34(2): 289-316.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle.  
1989 Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989: Iss.1, Article 8.
- Deagan, Kathleen.  
2001 Dynamics of Imperial Adjustment in Spanish America: Ideology and Social Integration. *Empires: Perspectives from Archaeology and History*. S. E. Alcock, T. N. D'Altroy, K. D. Morrison and C. M. Sinopoli. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
  
1983 *Spanish St. Augustine: The Archaeology of a Colonial Creole Community*. New York: Academic Press.
- Dercksen, Jan Gerrit.  
2017 New Evidence for Beeswax during the Old Assyrian Colony Period and the Ur III Period. *Movement, Resources, Interaction: Proceedings of the 2nd Kültepe International Meeting, Kültepe, 26-30 July 2015: Studies Dedicated to Klaas Veenhof: KIM 2 (Kültepe International Meetings 2)*. Fikri Kulakoğlu and Gojko Barjamovic eds. Subartu, 39. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Díaz-Andreu García, Margarita, ed.

- 2005 *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion*. London: Routledge.
- Di Leonardo, Micaela, ed.  
 1991 *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fahlander, Fredrik.  
 2012 Facing Gender Corporeality, Materiality, Intersectionality and Resurrection. *To tender gender: the pasts and futures of gender research in archaeology*. Back Danielsson, Ing-Marie, and Institutionen för Arkeologi och Antikens Kultur, eds. Stockholm studies in archaeology, 58. Stockholm: Dep. of Archaeology and Classical Studies.
- Fairburn, Andrew.  
 2014 Preliminary Archaeobotanical Investigations of Plant Production, Consumption, and Trade at Bronze Age Kültepe-Kanesh. *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity. Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series, 4*. Levent Atici, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, eds. Pp.177-193. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press.
- Ferguson, Susan.  
 2016 Intersectionality and Social-Reproduction Feminisms: Toward an Integrative Ontology. *Historical Materialism* 24(2): 38–60.
- Geller, Pamela L.  
 2009 Identity and Difference: Complicating Gender in Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 38(1): 65–81.
- Ghisleni Lara, Alexis M. Jordan, Emily Fiocoprile.  
 2016 Introduction to “Binary Binds”: Deconstructing Sex and Gender Dichotomies in Archaeological Practice. *Journal of Archaeological Method Theory* 23:765-787.
- Gilchrist, Roberta.  
 2009. The Archaeology of Sex and Gender. *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeology*. Chris Gosden, Barry Cunliffe, and Rosemary A. Joyce, eds. Pp. 1029-1047. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1999 *Gender and Archaeology: Contesting the Past*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Hertal, Thomas.  
 2014 The Lower Town of Kültepe: Urban Layout and Population. *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity. Journal of Cuneiform Studies*

*Supplemental Series, 4.* Levent Atici, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, eds. Pp.25-54. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press.

Insoll, Timothy, ed.

2007 *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*. London; New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Johnson, Matthew.

2010 *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction*. Second edition. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Joyce, Rosemary A.

2009 *Ancient Bodies, Ancient Lives: Sex, Gender, and Archaeology*. New York: Thames & Hudson.

2007 Girling the Girl and Boying the Boy: The Production of Adulthood in Ancient Mesoamerica. *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*. Timothy Insoll, ed. Pp. 77-86. London; New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Kotani, Ryoichi, Hiroshi Sudo, Yuji Yamaguchi, Yuichi S. Hayakawa, Takahiro Odaka.

2014 An Archaeological Survey in the Vicinity of Kültepe, Kayseri Province, Turkey. *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity*. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series, 4.* Levent Atici, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, eds. Pp.95-106. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press.

Larsen, Mogens Trolle.

2015 *Ancient Kanesh: A Merchant Colony in Bronze Age Anatolia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Larsen, Morgens Trolle and Agnete Wisti Lassen.

2014 Cultural Exchange at Kültepe. *Extraction & Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, Number 68.* Matthew W. Stolper, Michael Kozuh, Wouter Henkelman, Charles E. Jones, and Christopher Woods, eds. Pp. 171-188. Chicago, Illinois: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Lehner, Joseph W.

2014 Metal Technology, Organization, and the Evolution of Long Distance Trade at Kültepe. *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity*. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series, 4.* Levent Atici, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, eds. Pp.157-176. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press.

- Manning, Sturt W., Carol B. Griggs, Brita Lorentzen, et al.  
 2016 Integrated Tree-Ring-Radiocarbon High-Resolution Timeframe to Resolve Earlier Second Millennium BCE Mesopotamian Chronology. Xiaoyan Yang, ed. PLOS ONE 11(7): e0157144.
- Mellink, Machteld J.  
 1955 Archaeology in Asia Minor. *American Journal of Archaeology* 59(3): 231-240.  
 1956 Archaeology in Asia Minor. *American Journal of Archaeology* 60(4), 369-384.
- Meskill, Lynn.  
 2007 Archaeologies of Identity. *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*. Timothy Insoll, ed. Pp. 23-43. London; New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.  
 1999 *Archaeologies of Social Life: Age, Sex, Class et Cetera in Ancient Egypt. Social Archaeology*. Malden, MA: Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Michel, Cécile.  
 2016 Women and Real Estate in the Old Assyrian Texts. *Orient* 51(0): 83–94.  
 2015 Women in the Family of Ali-ahum son of Iddin-Suen (1993 Kültepe archive). *Proceedings of the 1st Kültepe International Meeting, Kültepe, 19-23 September 2013: Studies Dedicated to Kutlu Emre: KIM 1 = (KIM International Meetings 1) Subartu; Kültepe International Meetings (Series), XXXV. 1*. Fikri Kulakoğlu, and Cécile Michel, eds. Pp. 85-94. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.  
 2014 Considerations on the Assyrian Settlement at Kanesh. *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity. Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series, 4*. Levent Atici, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, eds. Pp.69-84. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press.  
 2013 Assyrian Women’s Contribution to International Trade with Anatolia. Billet. REFEMA. <https://refema.hypotheses.org/850>, accessed May 24, 2018.  
 2010 Women in Kanesh. *Anatolia’s Prologue: Kültepe, Kanesh, Karum: Assyrians in Istanbul*. Fikri Kulakoğlu and Selmin Kangal, eds. Pp. 54-62. Kayseri: Kayseri Metropolitan Municipality.  
 2008 The Old Assyrian Trade in the light of Recent Kültepe Archives. *Journal of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies*, pp.71-82.
- Nash, Jennifer C.  
 2016 Feminist Originalism: Intersectionality and the Politics of Reading. *Feminist Theory* 17(1): 3–20.

- 2008 Re-thinking Intersectionality. *Feminist Review* 89(1): 1-15.
- Nelson, Sarah M.  
2004 *Gender in Archaeology: Analyzing Power and Prestige*. 2nd ed. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Nicholson, L. J. ed.  
1997 *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Özgüç, Tahsin.  
1986 Kültepe-Kaniş II: Eski Yakındoğu'nun Ticaret Merkezinde Yeni Araştırmalar/ New Researches at the Trading Center of the Ancient Near East. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları Series V. Seri, volume 41. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.  
1959 Kültepe-Kaniş: Assur Ticaret Kolonilerinin Merkezinde Yapılan Yeni Araştırmalar / New Researches at the Center of the Assyrian Trade Colonies. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları Series V, volume 19. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.  
1950 Türk Tarih Kurumu Tarafından Yapılan Kültepe Kazısı Raporu 1948. / Ausgrabungen in Kültepe: Bericht über die im Auftrage der Türkischen Historischen Gesellschaft, 1948:Durchgeführten Ausgrabungen. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları Series V, volume 10. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Perry, Elizabeth, and Rosemary A. Joyce.  
2001 Providing a Past for "Bodies That Matter": Judith Butler's Impact on the Archaeology of Gender. *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies* 6(1/2): 63-76.
- Robin, Cynthia.  
2001 Peopling the Past: New Perspectives on the Ancient Maya. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 98(1): 18-21.
- Rowlands, Michael.  
2007 The Politics of Identity in Archaeology. *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*. Timothy Insoll, ed. Pp. 59-72. London; New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Rubin, Gail.  
1975. The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex. In *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by Rayna R. Reiter. Monthly Review Press, New York, pp. 157-211.
- Seeher, J.

- 2011 The Plateau: The Hittites. In S.R. Steadman, J.G. McMahon (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia, 10,000-323 B.C.E.* New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Stuart Tyson.
- 2003a *Wretched Kush*. London; New York: Routledge.
- 2003b Pharaohs, Feasts, and Foreigners: Cooking, Foodways, and Agency on Ancient Egypt's Southern Frontier. *The Archaeology and Politics of Food and Feasting in Early States and Empires*. T. Bray. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Spencer-Wood, Suzanne M.
- 2011 Introduction: Feminist Theories and Archaeology. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 7(1): 1-33.
- 2007 Feminist Gender Research in Classical Archaeology. *Women in Antiquity: Theoretical Approaches to Gender and Archaeology. Gender and Archaeology Series, v. 11*. Sarah M. Nelson, ed. Pp. 265- 299. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Stein, Gil J.
- 2012 Food Preparation, Social Context, and Ethnicity in a Prehistoric Mesopotamian Colony. *The Menial Art of Cooking: Archaeological Studies of Cooking and Food Preparation*. Sarah R. Graff, Enrique Rodríguez-Alegría, and Society for American Archaeology, eds. Pp. 42-63. Boulder, Colo: University Press of Colorado.
- Üstündağ, Handan.
- 2014 Human Remains from Kültepe-Kanesh: Preliminary Results of the Ola Assyrian Burials from the 2005-2008 Excavations. *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity. Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series, 4*. Levent Atici, Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Andrew Fairbairn, eds. Pp.157-176. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press.
- Yazicioğlu Santamaria, Gokce Bike.
- 2017 Locals, Immigrants, and marriage Ties at Kültepe: Results of Strontium Isotope Analysis on Human Teeth from Lower Town Graves. *Movement, Resources, Interaction: Proceedings of the 2nd Kültepe International Meeting, Kültepe, 26-30 July 2015: Studies Dedicated to Klaas Veenhof: KIM 2 (Kültepe International Meetings 2)*. Fikri Kulakoğlu, Gojko Barjamovic, and Klaas R. Veenhof, eds. Pp.63-84. Subartu, 39. Turnhout: Brepols.
- 2015 *The People of Kanesh: Residential Mobility, Community Life, and Cultural Pluralism in a Bronze Age City in Anatolia, Turkey*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, University of Chicago.